



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

instead of listing them under the leading word, Bonilla often chooses the first word of a phrase and places the note accordingly. For instance, the reader seeking information with regard to the play *Las tinieblas de Palestina* would hardly think of searching under the head of the pronoun *se*. The note to the play *Troya abrasada* is listed under *t*. That treating of the *Marqués de Mantua* appears under *c*, the first word of the phrase being *comedia*. This system, or lack of system, renders unnecessarily difficult of access much valuable information.

In a few instances, Bonilla's second thoughts do not seem to be so good as his first. In his former edition, for example, he explains the phrase *un nitesgut español* by suggesting what appears to be the obvious etymology: *nichts gut*. Pérez y González objected to this that the speaker was an Englishman, not a German, and that the meaning suggested by Bonilla would be an absurd anticlimax, coming after the far stronger objurgations of the Frenchman and the Italian.¹⁷ To this Bonilla made answer that Guevara probably understood almost nothing of either English or German.¹⁸ (The German remains dumb during the polyglot altercation.) This would seem a very sensible and likely explanation, but he now abandons it and boldly proposes the etymology: naughty guest. Of course, we are to give to naughty the strong meaning which it still retained when Shakespeare and Vélez wrote. Nevertheless, the etymology will appear plausible to few English-speaking readers. It is to be hoped that this trifle will not come to the notice of a certain Mantuan bachelor, Alonso de San Martín. That waggish critic would make the most of his opportunity.

In these days when the Biblioteca nacional and the Spanish Academy are under fire, one is not surprised to find an echo of the conflict in a work like the present. To Bonilla the Academy is as the *muleta* to the bull. His more recent writings have been filled with truculent attacks upon that venerable institution. Academies admittedly have their limitations, and private enterprise often leaves official endeavor lagging; but the world of letters has much for which to thank the Spanish

Academy. Bonilla might profitably read, in the *Opinions de Jérôme Coignard*, Anatole France's whimsical estimate of the French Academy. On the other hand, it is encouraging to note that Spaniards generally are demanding something better in the way of a dictionary. If ever good workman is justified in complaining of his tools, Bonilla is thoroughly justified in his attack upon the academy dictionary, that most inadequate aid in time of trouble. In a recent number of *España moderna*, Cejador y Frauca called the attention of his countrymen to the fact that since the publication of the *Diccionario de autoridades* next to nothing has been done by their dictionary makers in the way of systematic reading for new words and examples. That work, which was intended merely as a beginning has not been continued, he says, and subsequent lexicographers have worked it as a quarry without themselves adding to its store. It is to be hoped that some good will result from the present agitation and that each new Spanish dictionary will cease to be a copy of its predecessors. Bonilla's editions of the *Diablo cojuelo* offer the lexicographer of the future much valuable material. If the present reviewer has dwelt too exclusively upon *pecadillos*, it only argues his inability to detect serious *pecados*. The merits are taken for granted.

GEORGE TYLER NORTHUP.

Princeton University.

GERMAN ROMANTICISM.

Deutsche Romantik. Eine Skizze von Dr. OSKAR F. WALZEL. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1908. 168 pp.

Die Poetik der deutschen Romantiker, von CHR. D. PFLAUM. Berlin, Deutscher Schriftenverlag, 1909. 70 pp.

Die ältere Romantik und die Kunst des jungen Goethe, von Dr. HANS RÖHL. Berlin, Alexander Duncker Verlag, 1909. 164 pp.

Das romantische Drama. Eine Studie über den Einfluss von Goethes Wilhelm Meister auf das Drama der Romantiker, von KARL GEORG

¹⁷ Pérez y González, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

¹⁸ *Anales*, p. 199.

WENDRINER. Berlin, Oesterheld & Co., 1909. 168 pp.

Runge und die Romantik, von ANDREAS AUBERT. Berlin, Paul Cassirer, 1909. 135 pp.

During the last two decades German criticism has taken an active part in a romantic renaissance.¹ This tendency is well meant, since it undoubtedly owes its origin to the somewhat charitable belief that the success of the romanticists is traceable to the fact that they worked with a distinct purpose and according to a clearly defined programme. Modern investigation is therefore trying to find what lesson the romanticism of then has for the literature of now. The enthusiasm with which Walzel has restated the romantic theory and discussed the traditional romantic problems shows that also with him it has been neither a case of mere search after "Stoff," nor a passive response to the request to write vol. 232 of "Aus Natur und Geisteswelt." He came to his task with an exceptionally rich experience. And this has enabled him to set forth in 162 pages the genesis, rise, prosperity, decline and extenuation of so comprehensive a movement. The work covers, naturally with disparate completeness, the period from F. H. Jacobi's "Eduard Allwills Briefsammlung" (1792) to the completion of "Faust" (1832). But it is a contribution to philosophy rather than to literature. He has devoted just three-fourths of his space to the philosophy and poetics of the Jena school and the rest to the poetic creations of early and late romanticism, their connection and their contrast. Starting from the "Stürmer u. Dränger," he shows that these were not metaphysicians while the romanticists were, he carefully reviews the three stages in the development of rom. theory, and traces the metaphysical current from Kant to Hegel with explanatory digressions to Böhme, Bruno, Hemsterhuis, Rousseau, Spinoza and others. But then after all this argument by way of attempting to explain the *genesis* of romantic poetry, he asks the question: Did romantic poetry really grow out of this theory? The answer is a weak 'yes'

¹ Of 152 references listed by Wernaer under the heading "Historical works, Expositions and Monographs," only 31 antedate 1880, while 57 postdate 1900.

and a strong 'no.' The Jena school anticipated,² namely, some of the most essential elements of this theory, while the Heidelberg school carried them far beyond the limits intended by their originators. And even the philosophic part teems with unanswered questions, such as: Did Schleiermacher's "Reden" influence Schelling's "Weltseele" or *vice versa*? Walzel has, without intending to do so, emphasized the superlatively important fact that romantic philosophy is one thing, romantic poetry quite another. A solution of these questions may, from the standpoint of philosophy, be possible and altogether necessary; but experience has not proved that their solution, from the standpoint of real literature, is necessary or even desirable.

Though writing with the laudable desire to make nineteenth century rom. more completely "das Eigentum des deutschen Volkes," Pflaum has also approached his task philosophically. But it is difficult to see how such a study can make rom. popular. It is anything but a popular treatise. It will make a slight appeal to the German scholar, less to the German student, and still less to the English student. The style is forbiddingly heavy, with single sentences of 17 long, closely written lines (pp. 65-66). In a disproportionately elaborate introduction Pflaum makes a courageous defense of "Poetics" and gives an unnecessary survey of European rom. as bounded by Scott, Chateaubriand, Manzoni, Tieck, Oehlenschläger and Stagnelius. About one-fourth of the study is devoted to a discussion of points that have been made many times before. It is too late to write a new book showing, for example, that Hoffmann's interest in music influenced his literary creations. The best part of the discussion is that on Hölderlin. A similar study in Romance romanticism is to follow immediately from the same author. Whatever he may be able to do in that field, this is not the way to popularize German romanticism. There is still room in Germany for a purely practical picture of romanti-

² Walzel writes, p. 59: "In der poetischen Ausmünzung der Naturphilosophie lag vielleicht der beste Gewinn, den die Poesie aus der rom. Theorie ziehen konnte." Then, p. 137: "Abermals muss Tieck zugebilligt werden, dass seine Anschauung von Natur ihm zuteil geworden war, ehe er von rom. Naturphilosophie etwas wusste."

cism ; for a work that tabulates and appraises all those sources, themes, motives, devices and forms that characterize romantic creations. But there is precious little demand for philosophic studies on romantic poetics.

Röhl's monograph, on the contrary, is a model. It has what so many German studies lack,—form, method, balance and deference for the prevailing opinion. The theme is limited (*der junge Goethe to 1775*) but worked out with refreshing thoroughness. It is a book of testimony impersonally given and ably judged. As a study in "influence," it should find many imitators. The work shows that it is one thing to find a mere conscious imitation in the writings of an unprolific, unreceptive poet, like Fr. Schlegel, it is quite another to find an unconscious assimilation and imitation in the works of a prolific, receptive writer, like Tieck. Pt. I records the individual opinion of the old romanticists concerning young Goethe. Röhl divides them into three groups : (1) Fr. S., Dorothea and Schleiermacher, (2) A. W. S., Caroline and Schelling, (3) Tieck, Wackenroder and Novalis. The first group stood too far from young Goethe, the third too near him to get the correct estimate obtained by the second group. Pt. II discusses the influence of Goethe on the works of the romanticists. Aside from Schelling's "Widerporst" and Novalis, this is largely confined to Tieck. Among a number of interesting parallels, Röhl has established an overwhelming influence of *Werther* on Tieck. Pt. III discusses Goethe in connection with the four romantic problems : *Volks poesie*, *Shakespeare*, *Ossian* and *Hans Sachs*, and is confined principally to the Schlegels. A. W. Schlegel came to the first three of these through Bürger, to Hans Sachs through Tieck. It is a pity, however, that Röhl was obliged to discuss Fr. S. in this connection, whose changing, contradictory opinion on this sort of questions undoubtedly led Röhl to raise the stale and pointless question as to whether, in view of such wide discrepancies in temperament and opinion it is correct to speak of a romantic "school". But this can easily be overlooked. It is a convincing work. And by pointing out the enormous influence of young Goethe on Tieck and his congeners, Röhl has written the foreword to that still unwrit-

ten work : *Romantik und Sturm und Drang*. Then the book is replete with ideas not yet wholly current : that the significance of the phrase *der junge Goethe* was first established by the romanticists (p. 160), who were after all also the first Goethe-philologen (p. 161), that the romanticists were influenced by Goethe's "Knittelvers" rather than that of Hans Sachs (p. 103), that there was spare use of the expression "Sturm und Drang" until Tieck made it "gebräuchlich" in his 1828 edition of Lenz' *Schriften* (p. 68), and even the remarkable similarity between the life, work and development of Goethe and Tieck (p. 79).

Wendriner's study is another effort to set up *Wilhelm Meister* as the *Magna Charta* of German romanticism. This has been tried a number of times since Fr. Schlegel declared (1798) it to be one of the three greatest "tendencies" of the age. J. O. E. Donner found (1893) seven determinative points of similarity between *Meister* and the romantic novel : progressive culture, ne'er-dowells as heroes, pictures of sensuality, Mignons, Philines, mysterious births and interwoven lyrics. Wendriner now performs a somewhat similar task by way of determining the relation of *Meister* to the romantic drama. As a really suggestive study of the best known dramas of the German romanticists, as well as those of Oehlenschläger, the work is of enduring value. The ingenuity displayed in reaching certain conclusions necessitated by the very title of the study makes it also interesting. But the writer is naively enthusiastic as to the general influence of Goethe's novel, and entirely too arbitrary in his definition of "Schicksal", around which the main body of the discussion revolves. He claims (p. 37) that there are more romantic fragments in *Meister* than in the "Athenæum". He finds (pp. 29-39) ten important themes in *Meister* that influenced the romantic dramatists. But these themes and traits—such as the feeling of being misunderstood in a Philistine world—lay at the very root and heart of the romantic generation. They existed previous to 1796, and continued to exist after *Meister's* popularity had waned. Some of these are universal. And then, since Goethe in *Meister* ascribed "Zufall" to the novel and "Schicksal" to the drama, Wendriner analyzes the influence of

Goethe's novel on the romantic drama from this standpoint. He makes, however, the gravely exaggerated statement (p. 98) that "there is scarcely a page in the novel on which the word 'Schicksal' does not occur". After discussing the varying attitude toward "Fate" in Germany from 1770 to 1796, he comes to the harmless conclusion (p. 115) that Fate is "everything that stands over man and plays with him, whether it brings happiness or sorrow, whether it strikes the guilty or the innocent." He thus strips the term of its traditional meaning and makes it about equivalent to "motivation". And with this interpretation he analyzes the "Schicksalsdramen" from "Karl von Berneck" (1795) to "Fortunat" (1816). These dates are chosen because up to 1795 Tieck had ridiculed the idea of Fate, from then on he poetized it until in "Fortunat" he satirized it. "Die Braut von Messina" (1803) is not therefore considered the first Fate-tragedy, nor is "Der 24ste Februar" regarded as in any way dependent upon it. It is simply one in a series, differing from the others only in technique. In this way Wendriner has calmly overthrown the prevailing opinion and argued from a theory of his own making. And yet the book is valuable as a compilation and suggestive as a study.

In Jacobowski's "Anthologie rom. Lyrik" (Leipzig, 1900), there are a number of beautiful vignettes, a fine frontispiece and one lyric (Es blüht eine schöne Blume, pp. 148-149) by Philip Otto Runge, the Novalis of rom. painting with the "Dichtergeist in einem Malerauge." The lyric centres around "ein edles Blümelein" in a far off land. It is fragrant with the spirit of Böhme, Tieck, Novalis and Heine. Intimate with the Berlin-Jena school, admired by Goethe, stimulated by Schelling, and owing the same sort of fundamental debt to Tieck that Oehlenschläger owed to Steffens, Runge was a romanticist of the truest type. Yet Haym does not mention his name. Aubert has therefore rendered a grateful service. The work is based on Runge's *Hinterl. Schriften* (ed. by the artist's brother, Daniel, Hamb., 1840-1841). It contains precious few facts concerning Runge's life, nor does it show just wherein Runge's romanticism lay. But these facts can be secured from prosaic books, and

Runge's romanticism will spring into the eyes of all but the purblind. It is not a scientific treatise. It has no beginning, no middle, no end. The only mark of division is the paragraph. But it is an attractive book. The main interest centres around the discussion of Runge's *magnum opus*, "Die Tageszeiten," to which he considered everything else a preliminary study. The treatment of this one work throws radiant light on rom. nature-sense and art endeavour. There are 31 superb illustrations by Runge and one by his teacher, Jens Juel. Aubert has here written one of that long series of individual studies that will include Baader, Bernhardi, the Boissereés, Carus, Eschenmeyer, Loeben, Mesmer, Adam Müller, Passavant, Ringseis, Ritter, Reichardt, G. H. Schubert, Savigny, Solger, A. G. Werner, and others. And then, after all these studies have been written, the *general* history of German romanticism will have to be rewritten.

ALLEN WILSON PORTERFIELD.

Barnard College, Columbia University.

Les deux Poèmes de la Folie Tristan, publiés par JOSEPH BÉDIER. Paris: Firmin-Didot, Société des Anciens Textes Français, 1907. 8vo, vii, 129 pp.

Professor Bédier, in publishing the three volumes of his study of the legend regarding Tristan,¹ has presented, in convenient form, the Oxford and Berne versions of the episode "Tristan as fool." The Berne version had already been published by Professor Morf,² and the Oxford version by Francisque Michel.³ The latter work is now difficult to procure. In neither of the publications mentioned was a study of the language made. Professor Bédier has reproduced Morf's text with slight alterations. The reader is referred to Morf's article for a comparison of the two texts.

¹ *Le Roman de Tristan par Thomas, poème du xiii^e siècle*. Paris, SATF., 1902-1907. 2 vols., and the volume the title of which appears at the head of this review.

² *Romania*, xv, 1885, 558-574.

³ *Tristan. Recueil de ce qui reste des Poèmes relatifs à ses Aventures*. Londres, Pickering, 1835. 3 vols.